

C. D. Michel – SBN 144258  
[cmichel@michellawyers.com](mailto:cmichel@michellawyers.com)  
Joshua R. Dale – SBN 209942  
[jdale@michellawyers.com](mailto:jdale@michellawyers.com)  
Konstadinos T. Moros – SBN 306610  
[kmoros@michellawyers.com](mailto:kmoros@michellawyers.com)  
Alexander A. Frank – SBN 311718  
[afrank@michellawyers.com](mailto:afrank@michellawyers.com)  
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
180 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 200  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
Telephone: (562) 216-4444

Donald Kilmer-SBN 179986  
Law Offices of Donald Kilmer, APC  
14085 Silver Ridge Road  
Caldwell, Idaho 83607  
Telephone: (408) 264-8489  
Email: [Don@DKLawOffice.com](mailto:Don@DKLawOffice.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SOUTHERN DIVISION**

RENO MAY, an individual; ANTHONY  
MIRANDA, an individual; ERIC HANS,  
an individual; GARY BRENNAN, an  
individual; OSCAR A. BARRETTO, JR.,  
an individual; ISABELLE R.  
BARRETTO, an individual; BARRY  
BAHRAMI, an individual; PETE  
STEPHENSON, an individual; ANDREW  
HARMS, an individual; JOSE FLORES,  
an individual; DR. SHELDON HOUGH,  
DDS, an individual; SECOND  
AMENDMENT FOUNDATION; GUN  
OWNERS OF AMERICA; GUN  
OWNERS FOUNDATION; GUN  
OWNERS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.; THE  
LIBERAL GUN CLUB, INC.; and  
CALIFORNIA RIFLE & PISTOL  
ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ROBERT BONTA, in his official capacity  
as Attorney General of the State of  
California, and DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No.: 8:23-cv-01696 CJC (ADSx)

**EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS OF  
PLAINTIFFS TO DECLARATION  
OF LEAH GLASER FILED IN  
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S  
OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Hearing Date:	December 20, 2023
Hearing Time:	1:30 p.m.
Courtroom:	9 B
Judge:	Hon. Cormac J. Carney

**TO THIS HONORABLE COURT:**

Plaintiffs Reno May, Anthony Miranda, Eric Hans, Gary Brennan, Oscar A. Barretto, Jr., Isabelle R. Barretto, Barry Bahrami, Pete Stephenson, Andrew Harms, Jose Flores, Dr. Sheldon Hough, DDS, The Second Amendment Foundation, Gun Owners of America, Inc., Gun Owners of California, Inc., The Liberal Gun Club, Inc., and California Rifle & Pistol Association, Incorporated, hereby jointly object, pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403, 601, 702, 703, and 704 to the Declaration of Leah Glaser, lodged by Defendant in support of his Brief in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction. These objections are raised on the following grounds and as to the following matters contained within the declaration:

**1. Objection to Paragraph 15:**

Relevance. A discussion of park laws lacking a discussion of any firearms regulations is not relevant to whether historical analogues regulating firearms existed. Colonial era and English park laws are not relevant to the historical analogue analysis which focuses on the Founding and continues up through Reconstruction. *See New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. \_\_\_, 142 S. Ct. 2111, 2133 (2022).

**2. Objection to Paragraphs 18-19:**

Foundation. The declarant provides no citations to any sources for her opinion regarding the changing need or reason for public parks.

**3. Objection to Paragraph 20:**

Foundation. There is no citation to facts or sources provided to support the opinion expressed by the declarant, and no other information is provided by the declarant to support the origin of or veracity of the declarant's opinion.

Relevance. Opinions discussing Post-Reconstruction era non-firearm regulations are manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogue firearm laws and regulations that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation. *Bruen* at 2153-

54.

**4. Objection to Paragraphs 21-22:**

Foundation. The declarant provides no citations to any sources for her opinion regarding the changing need or reason for public parks.

Relevance. Opinions discussing a single public park designer's purported influences in designing parks, with no discussion of firearms laws or regulations, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

**5. Objection to Paragraph 23:**

Foundation. Most of the declarant's opinions, including the broad conclusions about historical views of parks, have no citation to sources or other information to allow the court to assess the origin or veracity of the declarant's opinion.

**6. Objection to Paragraph 24:**

Relevance. Opinions discussing the history and purported purpose behind the establishment of public parks are not relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

**7. Objection to Paragraphs 25-27:**

Relevance/Foundation. The declarant's generalized discussion of history has no relevance to the issue of firearm analogues, and none of the declarant's opinions have citation to sources or other information to allow the court to assess the origin or veracity of the declarant's opinions.

**8. Objection to Paragraphs 28-38:**

Relevance. Opinions discussing the history of Yosemite and other national parks, and Frederick Olmsted's views on the parks, lacking any discussion of firearms regulations applicable to such parks, are not relevant evidence of Founding

1 through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to  
2 show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

3 **9. Objection to Paragraph 39:**

4 Relevance. Opinions discussing the history of state park development,  
5 lacking any discussion of firearms regulations applicable to such parks, are not  
6 relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that  
7 governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.  
8 *Bruen* at 2153-54.

9 **10. Objection to Paragraph 40:**

10 Relevance. 1894 park laws are manifestly not relevant evidence of  
11 Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must  
12 produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

13 **11. Objection to Paragraph 41:**

14 Relevance. Opinions discussing the views of public parks of a single  
15 urban “reformer” in the Post-Reconstruction era are manifestly not relevant  
16 evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that  
17 governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

18 **12. Objection to Paragraphs 42-60:**

19 Relevance. Post-Reconstruction era and 20th century park laws are  
20 manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical  
21 analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of  
22 firearms regulation.

23 **13. Objection to Paragraph 61:**

24 Foundation. There is no citation to facts or sources provided to support the  
25 opinions expressed by the declarant regarding the rise of recreational activities in  
26 general, and no other information is provided by the declarant to support the origin  
27 of or veracity of the declarant’s opinion.

28 Relevance. Opinions discussing the history of Pre-and-Post-

1 Reconstruction recreational activities, absent a discussion of or citation to firearms  
2 regulations regarding such activities, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding  
3 through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to  
4 show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

5 **14. Objection to Paragraph 62:**

6 Relevance. Opinions discussing the history of socializing activities, absent  
7 a discussion of or citation to firearms regulations regarding such activities, are not  
8 relevant to the evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues  
9 that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms  
10 regulation.

11 **15. Objection to Paragraphs 63-65:**

12 Foundation. Opinions discussing the history of parks, museums, circuses,  
13 and traveling exhibitions, absent a discussion of or citation to firearms regulations  
14 regarding such places and events, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding  
15 through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to  
16 show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

17 **16. Objection to Paragraph 66:**

18 Foundation. There is no citation to facts or sources provided to support the  
19 opinion expressed by the declarant, and no other information is provided by the  
20 declarant to support the origin of or veracity of the declarant's opinion.

21 Relevance. Opinions discussing the history of World's Fairs, including  
22 Post-Reconstruction era fairs, absent a discussion of or citation to firearms  
23 regulations regarding such places and events, are not relevant to the evidence of  
24 Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must  
25 produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

26 **17. Objection to Paragraph 67:**

27 Relevance. Post-Reconstruction era regulations for the World's Fair are  
28 manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical

1 analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of  
2 firearms regulation.

3 **18. Objection to Paragraph 68:**

4 Relevance. Post-Reconstruction era regulations for a single amusement  
5 park are manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction  
6 historical analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition  
7 of firearms regulation.

8 **19. Objection to Paragraph 69:**

9 Foundation. There is no citation to facts or sources provided to support the  
10 opinion expressed by the declarant, and no other information is provided by the  
11 declarant to support the origin of or veracity of the declarant's opinion.

12 **20. Objection to Paragraph 70:**

13 Relevance. Opinions discussing the Post-Reconstruction era history of  
14 playground design and construction, also lacking any discussion of firearms  
15 regulations applicable to such playgrounds, are manifestly not relevant evidence of  
16 Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must  
17 produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

18 **21. Objection to Paragraph 71:**

19 Relevance. Opinions discussing the views of Progressives regarding Post-  
20 Reconstruction era history of playground usage, also lacking any discussion of  
21 firearms regulations applicable to such playgrounds, are manifestly not relevant  
22 evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that  
23 governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

24 **22. Objection to Paragraph 72:**

25 Foundation. There is no citation to facts or sources provided to support the  
26 opinion expressed by the declarant, and no other information is provided by the  
27 declarant to support the origin of or veracity of the declarant's opinion.

28 Relevance. Opinions discussing the Post-Reconstruction era usage of and

philosophies regarding playgrounds, also lacking any discussion of firearms regulations applicable to such playgrounds, are manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

**23. Objection to Paragraph 73:**

Relevance. Opinions discussing the Post-Reconstruction era usage of and philosophies regarding playgrounds, also lacking any discussion of firearms regulations applicable to such playgrounds, are manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

**24. Objection to Paragraph 74:**

Foundation. There is no citation to facts or sources provided to support the opinion expressed by the declarant, and no other information is provided by the declarant to support the origin of or veracity of the declarant's opinion.

Relevance. The Post-Reconstruction era and 20th century history of libraries, also lacking any discussion of firearms regulations applicable to such libraries, are manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

**25. Objection to Paragraphs 75-76:**

Relevance. Opinions discussing the Post-Reconstruction era and 20th century history of spectator sports, also lacking any discussion of firearms regulations applicable to such events, are manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

**26. Objection to Paragraphs 77-78:**

Relevance. Opinions discussing the Post-Reconstruction era and 20th century history of the development of recreational activities and those activities at



1 parks, also lacking any discussion of firearms regulations applicable to such places  
2 and activities, are manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through  
3 Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to show a  
4 history and tradition of firearms regulation.

5 **27. Objection to Paragraph 79:**

6 Foundation. There is no citation to facts or sources provided to support the  
7 opinion expressed by the declarant as to what restrictions on firearms and hunting  
8 in parks would or wouldn't be allowed.

9 Relevance. Opinions on the Post-Reconstruction era and 20th century  
10 restrictions on hunting in parks, even if such opinions were based upon citations to  
11 reliable sources, are manifestly not relevant evidence of Founding through  
12 Reconstruction historical analogues that governments must produce to show a  
13 history and tradition of firearms regulation.

14 **28. Objection to Paragraph 80:**

15 Foundation. There is no citation to facts or sources provided to support the  
16 broad opinion expressed by the declarant as to what the motivations were for  
17 political and business leaders to control behavior or provide leisure opportunities.  
18 Prior opinions by the declarant on these subjects similarly lacked citation to reliable  
19 sources or authorities that the court could reference to assess the bases for and  
20 veracity of the declarant's opinions.

21 Relevance. Opinions on the history of leisure and recreation and the  
22 places where those occurred, without identifying analogical histories or traditions of  
23 restricting firearms during the relevant period in those venues or at those events, is  
24 not helpful to the court or relevant evidence of Founding through Reconstruction  
25 historical analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition  
26 of firearms regulation.

27 For the reasons set forth above, the court should strike or disregard the  
28 declaration in its entirety in ruling on Plaintiffs' motion, or, in the alternative, strike



1 and disregard those identified opinions.

2  
3 Dated: November 20, 2023

**MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.**

4 /s/ C.D. Michel

C.D. Michel

Counsel for Plaintiffs

5  
6  
7 Dated: November 20, 2023

**LAW OFFICES OF DON KILMER**

8 /s/ Don Kilmer

Don Kilmer

9 Counsel for Plaintiff The Second Amendment  
Foundation

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case Name: *May, et al. v. Bonta*  
Case No.: 8:23-cv-01696 CJC (ADSx)

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT:

I, the undersigned, am a citizen of the United States and am at least eighteen years of age. My business address is 180 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200, Long Beach, California 90802.

I am not a party to the above-entitled action. I have caused service of:

**EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS OF PLAINTIFFS TO DECLARATION OF  
LEAH GLASER FILED IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION  
TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

on the following party by electronically filing the foregoing with the Clerk of the District Court using its ECF System, which electronically notifies them.

Robert L. Meyerhoff, Deputy Attorney General  
California Department of Justice  
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
Email: [Robert.Meyerhoff@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Robert.Meyerhoff@doj.ca.gov)  
*Attorney for Defendant*

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed November 20, 2023.

  
Christina Castron